

**RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER**

A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

ONE RODNEY SQUARE

920 NORTH KING STREET

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19801

(302) 651-7700

FAX (302) 651-7701

WWW.RLF.COM

TODD A. COOMES  
ASSOCIATE

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER  
302-651-7507  
COOMES@RLF.COM

October 19, 2007

**VIA Electronic Filing**

The Honorable Gregory M. Sleet  
United States District Court for the  
District of Delaware  
844 King Street  
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

RE: United States of America v. M.A. Hanna Plastics Group, Inc., et al.,  
Civil Action No. 06-409-GMS

Dear Chief Judge Sleet:

On behalf of defendant Wilmington Economic Development Corporation ("WEDCO"), we note that today's docket entry setting the trial date and start time in this action indicates it as being a "Bench Trial". As the Court may remember, WEDCO demanded a trial by jury in this action (see D.I. 22), and the parties discussed this demand with Your Honor during the November 22, 2006 scheduling conference (see D.I. 43, attached pages 23-24). At that time, the Court indicated that any party opposing the jury demand could move to strike such demand at the same time motions in limine were filed, and any issue could be resolved at the time of pretrial conference.

We write to clarify that the Court's docket entry of today setting the matter for trial on April 7, 2008 is not meant to alter or amend the above-described procedure for addressing the jury demand issue.

Respectfully,



Todd A. Coomes

cc: Clerk of the Court (By Hand)  
Patricia C. Hannigan, Esquire (By electronic filing)  
Michael W. Arrington, Esquire (By electronic filing)  
John Anthony Macconi, Jr., Esquire (By electronic filing)

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

3 - - -  
4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Civil Action  
5 :  
6 Plaintiff, :  
7 :  
8 v. :  
9 :  
10 M.A. HANNA PLASTICS :  
11 GROUP, INC., WILMINGTON :  
12 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT :  
13 CORPORATION AND SIDNEY :  
14 AND CAROL MAFFETT, :  
15 :  
16 Defendants. : No. 06-409 (GMS)

11 - - -  
12 Wilmington, Delaware  
13 Wednesday, November 22, 2006  
14 9:30 a.m.  
15 In Chambers  
16 - - -

17 BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, U.S.D.C.J.

18 APPEARANCES:

19 PATRICIA C. HANNIGAN, ESQ.  
20 Assistant United States Attorney  
21 -and-  
22 ANDREW GOLDMAN, ESQ.  
23 United States Environmental Protection Agency  
24 (Washington, D.C.)

25 Counsel for Plaintiff

1 THE COURT: That is not really my inclination.  
2 I was just thinking that out.

3 MR. SCAGNELLI: That is the concern. We want to  
4 be as efficient as we can in resolving this case.

5 THE COURT: What about the advisory jury  
6 thought?

7 MR. SCAGNELLI: I would view that as  
8 unnecessary. I think this Court has the jurisdiction to  
9 adjudicate the contract claims. I would also say the  
10 contract claims, at least from our perspective, really rise  
11 in the context of cost allocation because, I think the  
12 parties have effectively said, as to Hanna, they sold the  
13 property virtually for no consideration for WEDCO, that  
14 WEDCO knew what it was getting, they assumed liability for  
15 any environmental contamination. WEDCO is saying, that is  
16 not the case. Hanna knew about it or at that point Dayco  
17 knew about it and there was some fraud in the contract.  
18 That is really in the nature of cost-shifting and  
19 allocation. That is really I think what we are dealing with  
20 here.

21 Viewed from that perspective, I think we feel  
22 that that is all part of the 113(f) CERCLA contribution,  
23 that really is part and parcel -- another aspect of it,  
24 another aspect for the Court to consider but it really  
25 relates to contribution indemnification under common law.

1 So it is very difficult to break that out and to spend the  
2 resources to have an advisory jury, when really the only way  
3 to effectively -- we need one decision-maker with the entire  
4 factual context in mind to effectively rule there. That  
5 would be our view, anyway.

6 THE COURT: Understood.

7 The two-week time frame proposed for trying the  
8 case, did that contemplate a Bench or a jury trial?

9 MR. SCAGNELLI: Bench trial.

10 MR. WHETZEL: Jury trial from our perspective,  
11 Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: So you believe you are going to need  
13 two weeks on a Bench trial?

14 MR. SCAGNELLI: Yes.

15 THE COURT: Do you agree?

16 MS. HANNIGAN: Yes.

17 THE COURT: At this point, I am going to  
18 schedule it for two weeks. We are going to mark it down as  
19 a Bench trial. If WEDCO feels strongly enough about it to  
20 want to suggest briefing on it, we can do that.

21 MR. WHETZEL: I think the appropriate procedure,  
22 if I might suggest it, to make a record, Your Honor, would  
23 be for some party who objects to the demand to move to  
24 strike the jury demand and for us to brief that. I would  
25 request that the Court consider that procedure. It doesn't

1 have to be done now. Perhaps we can let the factual issues  
2 in the case develop for a while. I wouldn't suggest  
3 delaying that as long as case-dispositive motions. But I  
4 think we need to tee that issue up, and, respectfully, make  
5 a record on it.

6 THE COURT: You can move to strike. You can do  
7 it at the same time that you file your motions in limine.  
8 We can deal with this at the pretrial conference. It  
9 doesn't have to be dealt with before on summary judgment.

10 MR. WHETZEL: That is acceptable.

11 THE COURT: Particularly given your position  
12 that two weeks would be sufficient for a jury trial. So  
13 from my very parochial view, I am concerned about how many  
14 days I am going to need to schedule this case. Jury, non,  
15 it doesn't matter to me. It is a little more work for us,  
16 obviously, when we have a Bench. But that is okay.

17 MR. WHETZEL: As the Court is aware, we  
18 certainly try far more complex technology cases to juries in  
19 shorter periods of time.

20 THE COURT: Absolutely. I will accede to the  
21 parties' recommendation, to two weeks, ten business days for  
22 a Bench trial.

23 We will deal with the jury issue if and when it  
24 ripens further.

25 Anything else that we haven't covered? I think

1 we talked about everything. All the dates I think are  
2 accounted for.

3 Anything else on your minds, counsel?

4 MR. SCAGNELLI: No, I think we have covered it,  
5 Your Honor. We thank you.

6 THE COURT: Thank you and have a safe and  
7 enjoyable Thanksgiving.

8 (Counsel respond "Thank you.")

9 (Conference concluded at 10:20 a.m.)

10 - - -

11 Reporter: Kevin Maurer  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25